



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,848	12/21/2000	Vladislav Vashchenko	NSC1-H2000 (P04846)	4415

7590

07/18/2003

Mark C. Pickering
Law Offices of Mark C. Pickering
P.O. Box 300
Petaluma, CA 94953-0300

EXAMINER

NADAV, ORI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/747,848

Applicant(s)

VASHCHENKO ET AL.

Examiner

ori nadav

Art Unit

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 31-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2811

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 31-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Duvvury et al. (5,493,133)

Duvvury et al. teach in figure 2 and related text an ESD protection structure formed in a P type semiconductor material 42 comprising an isolation region (the FOX region located between regions 52 and 54) formed in the semiconductor material, an N-well region 44 in the semiconductor material, contacting the isolation region, not contacting an N+ region and having a dopant concentration less than that of the first region, an N+ first region 50 formed in the semiconductor material and being spaced apart from the N-well region 44 and being connected to a first ground line, no N type region having dopant concentration greater than that of the well region lying between the first region and the isolation region, and a P+ second region 52 formed in the well 44, contacting the isolation region, the first region 50 and the second region 52 lying on opposite sides of the isolation region, no P type region having dopant concentration greater than that

Art Unit: 2811

of the semiconductor material lying between the second region 52 and the isolation region, the second region 52 being connected to an I/O power second line 48, the second line not being connected to the first line.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duvvury et al. in view of Monticelli (4,758,873).

Regarding claim 49, Duvvury et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied to claim 31 above, except connecting the ESD device to a differential amplifier, wherein the second region is connected to the amplifier and the first region is connected to a positive differential voltage. Monticelli teaches in figure 1 and related text the need for an ESD device to be connected to a differential amplifier in order to prevent damage to the input transistors of the amplifier. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to connect Duvvury et al.'s device to a differential amplifier, wherein the second region is

Art Unit: 2811

Duvvury et al.'s device to a differential amplifier, wherein the second region is connected to the amplifier and the first region is connected to a positive differential voltage in order to operate the device in an application which requires a differential amplifier.

Regarding claim 50, Duvvury et al. do not teach in figure 2 a plurality of protection diodes. Duvvury et al. teach in figure 3 a plurality of protection diodes. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a plurality of protection diode circuits in Duvvury et al.'s device in order to operate the device in an application which requires a plurality of protection diodes.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 31-50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Reference B is cited as being related to an ESD protection device.

Art Unit: 2811

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology center (TC) 2800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to TC 2800 via the TC 2800 Fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 4-C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 2811 Fax Center number is (703) 308-7722 and 308-7724. The Group 2811 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Group 2811 applications.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or any earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to *Examiner Nadav* whose telephone number is **(703) 308-8138**. The Examiner is in the Office generally between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas, can be reached at **(703) 308-2772**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **Technology Center Receptionists** whose telephone number is **308-0956**



O.N.
July 13, 2003

ORI NADAV
PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800